

## MEETING SUMMARY

## CINCINNATI MUNICIPAL AIRPORT-LUNKEN AIRPORT CTAG#6 March 16, 2004

Meeting called by: City of Cincinnati  
Facilitator: Cheri Rekow, DOT&E Aviation Division  
Meeting summary prepared by PB Aviation/ City Staff

### Attendees:

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. Michael Burns, Indian Hill                        | 20. David Schlothauer, PB Aviation                   |
| 2. Pat McDevitt                                      | 21. Ed Cecil, PB Aviation                            |
| 3. Mike Lacinak, Mt. Washington Community Council    | 22. Bart Gover, PB Aviation                          |
| 4. Scot Conover, Columbia Tusculum Community Council | 23. Bill Fischer, Community Development and Planning |
| 5. John Frank, Board of Realtors                     | 24. Albert Peter, Anderson Township Trustee/LAOAB    |
| 6. Andrew Betts, Sierra Club                         | 25. Susan Holzapfel, Indian Hill/LAOAB               |
| 7. Tom Ewing, Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce | 26. Steve Crow, ATCT                                 |
| 8. Krissi Barr                                       | 27. Harold Blocher II, City of Highland Heights      |
| 9. Kathy Tyler, Midwest Jet/FBO (for Dan O'Neil)     | 28. Bryan Snyder, HCRPC                              |
| 10. Bill Posey, FBO Rep.                             | 29. Salty Roark, LNC                                 |
| 11. Erik Nelson, Private Pilots                      | 30. Doug Adams, Mariemont                            |
| 12. Tom Edwards, Flight Depot                        | 31. Judy Zehren, Mt Washington                       |
| 13. Dan Dickten, Lunken Airport Administrator, DOT&E | 32. Bill Ohl, FAA-CVG                                |
| 14. Cheri Rekow, Aviation Division, DOT&E            | 33. Deborah Conrad, KCAB-CVG                         |
| 15. Bob Vickery, City of Cincinnati, DOT&E           | 34. Reginald Victor, City of Cincinnati, DOT&E       |
| 16. Eileen Enabnit, Director, DOT&E                  | 35. Will Brown, Mt. Lookout Civic Club               |
| 17. Don Rosemeyer, City Engineer, DOT&E              |  |
| 18. Steve Fagel, City Law Department                 |  |
| 19. Mike Brenner, DOT&E Aviation Division            |  |

Agenda Topic	Presenter	Discussion
<b>Greeting &amp; Introductions</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>City staff, Consultants CTAG and CTAG/AC members</li> <li>Opening comments</li> </ul>	Eileen Enabnit, Director, DOT&E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ms. Enabnit welcomed each of the returning CTAG members and initiated introduction of those in attendance.</li> <li>Ms. Enabnit made opening remarks, including a brief explanation of the last CTAG meeting and tonight's special presentation from the Strategic Program for Urban Redevelopment (SPUR) regarding potential Brownfield development opportunities near the Airport.</li> </ul>
<b>Review of CTAG Meeting #5</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opening comments</li> <li>Review of revised Goals &amp; Objectives</li> </ul>	Cheri Rekow, DOT&E Aviation Division	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ms. Rekow reviewed the process for development of the Lunken Airport Goals &amp; Objectives, including the latest changes reflecting discussion during CTAG meeting #5 and the added new language for an added goal/objectives pertaining to noise/monitoring (<i>was it noise or noise monitoring?</i>).</li> <li>Ms. Rekow encouraged CTAG members and other attendees to utilize the website which hosts the latest documents for the Master Plan Update. <a href="http://www.cincinnati-oh.gov/transeng/pages/-7217-/">http://www.cincinnati-oh.gov/transeng/pages/-7217-/</a></li> </ul>
<b>Strategic Program for Urban Redevelopment (SPUR) presentation</b>	Bill Fischer, SPUR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr. Fischer began his presentation with a brief introduction of SPUR's mission, which includes protection of public health, recycling of land and the creation of jobs within the community.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr. Fisher explained the multi-tiered program structure of SPUR. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The first purpose in SPUR is to map areas of potential opportunity within the region. Initial site identification was done several years ago</li> <li>○ The second purpose of SPUR is to create an inventory of each area for site-specific characteristics. The inventory collection process consists of a windshield survey and is ongoing.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Mr. Fischer described District #15, adjacent to the Airport property that may be an opportunity for a Brownfield redevelopment project. District #15 contains an auto salvage yard operation accessed by Kellogg Avenue.</li> <li>• Mr. Fischer identified several constraints such as environmental clean-up requirements, impacts to the floodplain and the lack of developer interest as issues, which must be resolved before a development project could begin.</li> <li>• Mr. Fischer discussed several federal/state funding sources available for environmental clean up and development that should be leveraged with matching funds.</li> <li>• Mr. Fischer concluded his presentation with questions from the audience. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Is money through SPUR available to relocate the levee?</i> None through SPUR. But possible funding sources include: Clean Ohio Fund, the Army Corps of Engineers, and creative developer financing.</li> <li>2. <i>If the development where to occur, would the money generated go to the Airport's operating fund or the general budget?</i> Money generated by development would be in the form of taxes, both property and earnings. They would go into the City and County general funds just like taxes generated by any other business in the City. (Ms. Enabnit)</li> <li>3. <i>How many acres in total size is District #15?</i> Mr. Fischer did not have that information available.</li> <li>4. <i>What is the time frame to remediate District #15?</i> Mr. Fischer would need more information about the site before making a determination on the length of remediation.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>
<b>Airport Layout Plans Alternatives Discussion</b>	<p>Ms. Eileen Enabnit, Director DOT&amp;E</p> <p>David Schlothauer, PB Aviation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ms. Enabnit opened the Airport Layout Plans discussion by encouraging the CTAG members to provide comments and/or suggestions for ideas to be included in the development of the hybrid concept projects.</li> <li>• Ms. Enabnit introduced David Schlothauer of PB Aviation to discuss each of the core projects within each of the alternatives.</li> <li>• Mr. Schlothauer quickly recapped each of the processes the Master Plan Update has been through up to the present.</li> <li>• Mr. Schlothauer identified the core projects as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ R/W Extension for 3R/21L</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ R/W 7 RSA Clearance</li> <li>○ Parallel Taxiway for 3R/21L</li> <li>○ Taxiway C Relocation</li> <li>○ Corporate Lease Area Development</li> <li>○ FBO Lease Area Development</li> <li>○ SASO Lease Area Development</li> <li>○ ATCT Location</li> <li>○ Hangar #3 Aviation Museum Site</li> <li>○ Airport Related Development</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr. Schlothauer discussed the advantages and disadvantages of the location of each of the core projects within each of the three alternatives. He also explained that this information, incorporated with comments we receive, will be presented in an evaluation matrix at the next CTAG meeting.</li> </ul> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>R/W Extension for 3R/21L</b> - By extending R/W 3R/21L to 7,000', enough runway length will be available for the critical aircraft (G-550) to operate during Maximum Take Off Weight (MTOW) conditions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternative A, a southward extension of 899' on R/W 3R will provide a full 7'000' for departures (take-off) but will be limited to 6,101' for arrivals (landing). The existing hill to the south creates an obstruction to the approach of 3R requiring a displaced threshold.</li> <li>• Alternative B meets the facility requirement of 7,000' by adding an 899' extension to the northern end of R/W 21L. Unlike Alternative A, Alternative B has a full 7,000' for departures and arrivals.</li> <li>• Alternative C is a combination of Alternative A &amp; B. A 450' extension to R/W 3R and a 449' extension to R/W 21L combine with the existing R/W length to make a full 7,000'. Like Alternative A, a 449' displaced threshold will exist due the hill to the south. As a result, southern arrivals have only 6,551' to land verses 7,000' for northern arrivals.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. <b>R/W 7 RSA Clearance</b> - Currently, the Runway Safety Area for R/W 7 contains two violations which must be removed. Both Hangar #3 and Airport Road lie within the RSA and pose significant safety issues for arriving and departing aircraft. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternative A seeks to remove Hangar #3 from the RSA and relocate it to the north for a proposed museum site. Airport Road is also relocated 200' south in order to remove the road from the RSA.</li> <li>• Alternative B also corrects the existing RSA by removing Hangar #3 to the north for a proposed museum site. Airport Road is proposed to be closed as a result of the levee being relocated south to Kellogg Avenue achieving a clean RSA.</li> <li>• Alternative C removes Hangar #3 and relocates it to the North just off Wilmer Avenue. Airport Road remains open in its existing location, as does the levee.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>
--	--	---

3. **Parallel Taxiway for 3R/21L** - In each of the three alternatives a parallel taxiway to R/W 3R/21L is included. The parallel taxiway is a safety project designed to remove aircraft from the runway quicker, allowing decreased taxi time and fuel efficiency.
4. **Taxiway C Relocation** - The relocation of Taxiway C is included in each of the three alternatives. The relocation of Taxiway C creates land on the existing Airport that can be used for SASO and FBO development.
  - In Alternative A, Taxiway C is relocated 400' to the northeast in order to provide expanded space for SASO and FBO development. The midfield development in Alternative A requires a tunnel under Taxiway C to provide access to the midfield.
  - Alternative B requires Taxiway C to be relocated 1000' to the northeast to provide room for corporate, SASO and FBO development.
  - Alternative C requires Taxiway C to be relocated 400' northeast for two separate FBO lease areas.
5. **Corporate Lease Area Development**

Due to Lunken's role as a corporate airport, providing land for the expansion of the existing corporate lease areas is anticipated to be the single largest segment of growth at Lunken.

  - Alternative A shows the corporate development occurring in two locations. The first location is in the northern corner of the Airport between the parallel runways. The second area is in the midfield, adjacent to R/W 3R/21L.
  - Alternative B shows the corporate lease area development near the existing Hangar #2 site.
  - In Alternative C, the proposed corporate lease area is located north of R/W 7/25 near the terminal building.
6. **Fixed Base Operator (FBO) Lease Areas** - In each of the three alternatives, the location of future FBO development is positioned according to the respective alternative design and anticipated aircraft operation.
  - The location of the FBO's in Alternative A remains near their current locations. North of R/W 7/25, the existing Midwest Jet Center FBO is positioned in order to allow future growth without physically relocating. The second FBO, Million Air, is also positioned in the same location, allowing for future growth.
  - In Alternative B, the FBO's are located near their existing locations; however Million Air is shown in a separate building do to the amount of space available for development.
  - Alternative C shows the future FBO areas

relocated along taxiway C. Midwest Jet Center would be moved south of R/W 7/25 to allow for its future growth while Million Air stays near its existing location. MillionAir would be required to build a new building given the existing space limitations.

**7. Special Aviation Service Operations (SASO) Lease Areas**

- Alternative A depicts the SASO area located in two places on the Airport. The first SASO location is south of R/W 7/25, just north of Hangars #2 and #3. The second SASO area is located in the midfield, closest to the relocated taxiway C.
- In Alternative B, the SASO area is combined in the southern portion of the airfield between the parallel runways. This area provides enough room for potential needs throughout the 20-year period.
- Alternative C shows the proposed SASO development in the northern corner of the Airport near Wilmer Avenue. This alternative shows the consolidation of each type of lease area.

**8. Air Traffic Control Tower (ATCT) Location –** sites are determined by placement of existing and proposed facilities in order to preserve visibility of runways and taxiways

- In Alternative A, the ATCT is relocated to the midfield in order to provide unobstructed line of sight. This relocation would require an additional controller to manage air traffic.
- Alternative B relocated the ATCT to the northern corner of the Airport in order to provide unobstructed line of sight. This alternative would require an additional controller.
- Alternative C moves the existing control tower approximately 400' south. Relocation to the south provides clean line of sight to the north and does not require an additional controller.

**9. Hangar #3 / Aviation Museum Site -** As mentioned in the RSA 7 clearance requirement, the location of Hangar #3 creates a safety hazard for aircraft approaching and departing from R/W 7/25. Each of the proposed alternatives relocates Hangar #3 outside the RSA. In each of the three alternatives, Hangar #3 is relocated to the northern corner of the Airport (extending into the golf course). In each alternative, Hangar #3 is converted into an aviation museum with airside access. This project is very complicated and costly. The feasibility will be evaluated further as we move closer to implementation.

		<p>10. <b>Airport Related Development</b> - Other on-airport related development consists of an aeronautical college, proposed T-hangars and the creation of an aviation museum. Alternatives A and B provide space for an aeronautical college (or other development) inside the area formerly occupied by underutilized heavy manufacturing-zoned land. Alternative C does not incorporate development near the levee but allows for T-hangar construction in the southwestern corner of the Airport.</p>
--	--	---

## Question & Answer Period

### CTAG # 6

PB Aviation, March 16, 2004

1. What impact does going into the golf course pose for the function of the golf course?

Answer: At this point the impacts are still unknown. A golf course designer is scheduled to consult with the City to determine the impacts of each alternative with respect to the functionality and integrity of the golf course. It is the intent of the plan that the integrity of golf course and adjacent recreational uses be maintained.

2. In alternative B, will the approach have to be displaced as a result of the hill behind R/W 21L?

Answer: No, enough room exists to maintain the current threshold at the actual runway end.

3. What is the difference between relocating a segment of the runway verses establishing a displaced threshold?

Answer: Relocating a segment of the R/W actually requires the physical relocation of pavement, usually to the end of a runway. Relocating a runway requires the glide slope to be moved in order to reflect the new end of the R/W. Establishing a displaced threshold only moves the designated touchdown zone as a result of obstructions blocking the approach to the runway. The glide slope remains the same in the presence of a displaced threshold.

4. Each of the Alternatives shows a proposed T-hangar development in the southern corner of the Airport. Is T-hangar development the only type of aviation development practical for this area?

Answer: No, any type of corporate development would be practical for this area. T-hangars are shown because it is in the Airport's existing plans and has been approved.

5. With regards to the T-hangar development, Why hasn't there been more T-hangar development in the past with such a waiting list of potential users?

Answer: The issue with new t-hangar development is purely financial. To date, no developers have been willing to meet the City's requirements for participation in the construction of the new t-hangars.

6. Who pays for the individual projects within each of the respective alternatives?

Answer: Airfield projects such as construction of runways, taxiways and obstruction clearance are funded through a combination of funding from the FAA and the Lunken Airport Aviation Fund. Private development such as new corporate buildings and other private facilities are funded by private individuals or businesses. Other Airport capital projects such as T-hangars, apron expansion and a museum would be funded through a combination of private funding and the Aviation Fund.

7. Will noise contours be developed for R/W 7/25 and the run-up pads?

Answer: Yes, noise contours for each of the three runways and the proposed run-up pads were generated to reflect the 2022 DNL noise contour. This was done for each of the proposed alternatives.

8. Will the preferred alternative be one of the three alternatives shown or will it be a combination of the three?

Answer: The preferred alternative could be one of the three. However, it is anticipated that the preferred alternative will be a hybrid of elements shown in the three alternatives. This allows us to incorporate the individual projects that best meet the needs of the Airport and the goals and objectives of the master plan.

9. Does a longer runway mean more operations?

Answer: Lengthening a runway does not add operational capacity to the runway. Only one aircraft can use the

runway at one time. Lengthening a runway may change the type of operations occurring on the runway. With respect to Lunken, extending the runway by 899' is needed to meet the needs of the 2005 critical aircraft for the Airport, which is on the Airport right now, but cannot depart fully weighted. It is also important to note that Lunken Airport is anticipated to grow only 1.8%-- that is the annual compounded growth rate forecasted for the 20-year period from 2002 to 2022 (132,214 ops to - 187,742 ops).

10. Is there any chance an unforeseen problem or event could stop the development of a project resulting from a change in demand?

Answer: If we understand the question correctly, then the answer is, not likely, because the development of a project is initiated as a result of activity not demand. If necessary, we can clarify the question and answer at the next CTAG meeting.

11. Are there other opportunities to build a new golf course someplace else and allow the Airport to encroach on the existing golf course?

Answer: None that we are aware of. The Otto Armledder Nature Preserve, under development, does not include a golf course in its design or funding.

12. In the previous master plan (1989), a precision approach to R/W 3R was proposed but now is not proposed in 2002 master plan update. Why?

Answer: The recommendation to pursue a precision approach to R/W 3R was based on the development of microwave technology allowing for a curved precision approach to 3R. Several years after the introduction of microwave technology, newer technical advances such as GPS, provided a less expensive and more reliable method of navigation. As precision approaches using GPS still await FAA approval, a precision approach to 3R at Lunken Airport has been removed from the plan until the approach obstructions are removed.

13. The previous master plan also featured high-speed exits off R/W 3R/21L. The new plan does not, why?

Answer: At the time of the previous master plan, the development of high-speed exits was proposed to increase capacity on the Airport's runway system. Since September 11<sup>th</sup>, smaller aircraft activity continues to decrease, making high-speed exits less desirable and more costly than traditional exits off the runway.

14. The previous master plan reported the Annual Service Volume (ASV) of Lunken Airport to be 295,000 operations. The current plan reports the ASV at 225,000. Is this difference attributed to changes in the fleet mix?

Answer: Several changes are responsible for a lower present day ASV. These include: change in fleet mix, increased cost to operate equipment, aircraft insurance, airport congestion, and other general trends in aviation.

15. Has Proctor and Gamble done an analysis which shows a runway extension to the south in order to meet their operational requirements for the G-550?

Answer: P&G has reviewed runway extension alternatives for both north and south and provided input, as have many others. Operational requirements for the new corporate critical aircraft, the Gulfstream V series, will continue to be reviewed and discussed as the development of a preferred alternative continues.

### **General Comments**

16. Comment: Any disruption to the golf course would directly impact the recreational usage of all the facilities, not just the golf course.

17. Comment: Concern for impacts to the golf course is not the only area in jeopardy of development. The Magridge Nature Preserve exists off the end of R/W 3R and deserves just as much concern for protection as the golf course does.

18. With respect the removal of obstructions from R/W 7's RSA, several CTAG members support keeping Hangars #1 and #2 in their current location but moving hangar #3 out of the RSA. The cost and options to remove Hangar #3 as a runway obstruction is under consideration at this time.

19. One CTAG member suggested establishing a historic district or designation for Hangar #3 but relocate it outside the R/W 7 RSA. Other members identified the maintenance costs associated with the conversion of Hangar #3 into an aviation museum.

20. Mr. Dickten, Airport Director expressed concern for Alternatives A and B relocation of the existing detention basin from the midfield to an area southeast of R/W 3R/21L. Specifically, his concern relates to the presence of standing water that would attract birds and other wildlife to the Airport creating a safety hazard for aircraft. He

believes the detention basin should be covered or put underground to avoid wildlife attraction.

21. Ms. Rekow, DOT&E (Aviation Division) reinforced the need for each alternative to have designated engine run-up pads for both maintenance and preflight operations.
22. One CTAG member expressed support for Alternative B's plan to relocate Taxiway C in order create an additional developable land. If Taxiway C is to be relocated, than it seems foresighted to go as far as possible.
23. Another CTAG member described the great view shed existing from the terminal building. His concern for damaging the visual integrity of the view from the terminal building is most compromised by Alternative B's 1000' relocation of Taxiway C.
24. Mr. Crow, Lunken Airport ATCT stressed his concern for relocating the ATCT to the midfield. Any relocation to the Midfield would require an additional controller, given a 360-degree operating area. Lunken Airport ATCT supports any alternative that keeps them as close to the same site as they have now.
25. Ms. Rekow, DOT&E (Aviation Division), ask that each CTAG member representing Lunken tenants meet with their constituents to discuss the proposed alternatives, including the concept of separating FBO, Corporate and SASO uses (private vs. public).
26. Mr. Edwards, Flight Depot, expressed his support for keeping Hangars #2 and #1 in their existing location but moving Hangar #3. Mr. Edwards also supports maintaining the view shed from the terminal building. He supported Alternative A, keeping the ATCT as in Alternative C and keeping R/W 7/25 at 5,000' as in Alternative C.

Next Steps	Cheri Rekow, DOT&E, Aviation Division	<b>The first Master Plan Update Public Workshop will be held on Thursday March 25, 2004 from 4-7 P.M. at the Carnegie Center.</b>
Next CTAG Meeting		April 20, 2004 H.C. Nutting Ctr. 4:00-7:00pm
Meeting Adjourned		6:25 P.M.